

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/370,601	08/10/1999	KRISTINE B. FUIMAONO	34063/KMO/W1	8267
23363 75	590 06/02/2003			
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			EXAMINER	
350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD SUITE 500			RODRIGUEZ, CRIS LOIREN	
PASADENA, O	CA 91105			
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	
			DATE MAILED: 06/02/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Application No.	Applicant(s)	الق
Advisory Action	09/370,601	FUIMAONO, KRISTINE B.	_
	Examiner	Art Unit	
<u> </u>	Cris L. Rodriguez	3763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 19 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: ('condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in	ued
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee the final Office action; or (2) as set f	under forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) $\square$ they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	in better form for appeal by ma	erially reducing or simplifying	ng the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · · ——		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amend	ment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place	the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	1
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>2-23, 48, 49, 51, 52</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10.  ☐ Other:			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: LOrentzen discloses that the fluid is for cooling purposes. Panescu teaches that the electrode can be open and closed, and that in both configurations the fluid cools the electrode. Since both are ablation devices with similar intended use, the modification would not render the prior art invention unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700